

Salt Lake Valley Quality Improvement Committee First Quarter 2009

Attendees: Chris Chytraus, Cheryl Dubach, Sharon Graser, Mike Hamblin, Curt Hansen, Karen Hansen, Patricia Haslam, Teresa Jacobs, Annette Jan, Marilyn Johnson, Steve Leyba, Diane Moore, Tonya Myrup, Evan Nebeker, Marcela Rodriguez, Mindy Simon, Stephanie Steele, Arn Stolp, Patricia Worthington, Marilee Greenland (minutes)

Excused: Misty Butler, Sharon Hughes, Peggy Jerome, Diane Moore

Visitors: Navina Forsythe, Dawn Prince

| | | Review and Action Plan | Follow-up |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Dash Board Items: | Staff Retention and Recognition (February 17, 2009) | <p>January: Reviewed employee exit interviews. Pay is still an issue of retention (see handout). Committee agreed to give employees flashlights as “Heart of Gold” token gift of appreciation for Valentines day.</p> <p>February: A valentine was e-mailed to staff and flashlights were handed out.</p> <p>March:</p> | <p>January: Committee will review in six months. Chris Chytraus will send e-mail to employees about funds for flashlights.</p> <p>February: The flashlights were well received. Flashlights were given to committee members also.</p> <p>March:</p> |
| | CPS Missed Priority Timeframe (August 19, 2008) | <p>January:</p> <p>February:</p> <p>March:</p> | <p>January:</p> <p>February:</p> <p>March:</p> |
| | Foster Care Placement Stability (February 17, 2009) | <p>January: Reviewed placement termination reasons after training of staff. (see handout)</p> | <p>January: The percentage of correct coding has improved, but more work is needed.</p> |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Foster Care Placement Stability (cont.) | February: 4 and 5 th District Court will be holding an Improve Placement Stability Summit on March 2 and 3. | February: Misty Butler will attend and report back to the committee. |
| | | March: | March: |
| | Drugs Abuse (January 20, 2009) | <p>January: Reviewed CPS cases supported with drugs and alcohol (see attachment)</p> <p>February:</p> <p>March:</p> | <p>January: The percentage of home based cases in Tooele and Magna have improved. There were fewer children sent to foster care. The committee will re-evaluate in six months.</p> <p>February:</p> <p>March:</p> |
| | Dashboard Items | <p>January: DCFS was asked last month to bring dashboard ideas from staff. Ideas are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kinship support - Anything committee can do encourage the community to help 2. In-home services (e.g. Family Support Centers, Peer Parenting) With the concern that partners will lose funding, how can the committee assist to wrap services around the children? 3. Volunteerism – Peer Parenting Volunteers who have experienced kinship placement to educate new kinship guardian/parents. Volunteers who have had positive and negative experiences to assist in the navigation of the kinship placement process. What could DCFS do with volunteers? How could volunteers be used to help families? Youth mentoring program? <p>All three of these suggestions connect together to wrap services around the children.</p> | <p>January: Chris Chytraus sent an e-mail to Rick Smith, chair of the State QIC addressing the issue of drug endangered children. The request was to look at drug endangered children at the state level vs. region.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|
| | Dashboard Items (cont.) | Additional ideas suggested by committee members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent approach with substance abusing families and children | |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of services • What can QIC do to make sure DHS does not sink to the bottom of the list with the legislature? <p>February: Dashboard items discussed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kinship licensing - DCFS is already working on new packets to be handed to families when there is a removal or new kinship. • Children served by the Court - Abused and Neglected vs. Delinquency. When a delinquent child is ordered into the custody of DCFS the worker is not usually represented by legal counsel. The District Attorney is present who represents the County; and is unable to give the worker advice because of conflict of interest. The Attorney General (who represents DCFS) is not usually present in these hearings. The workers are trained to handle abuse and neglect cases. • Funding for DCFS - Arn Stolp spoke to Ron Bigelow, representative for West Valley. Ron said they don't want to touch DCFS funding because they are worried the law suit will come back. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February: The committee agreed to adopt Children served by the Court - Abused and Neglected vs. Delinquency as the next dashboard item to work. <p>Research that will be examined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navina Forsythe's research • Amanda Singer's study <p>Goals: What does the committee want to measure?</p> <p>Suggestions to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the reason the child originally came into custody? • What kinds of children are being ordered into care; and what kind of placement is ordered? • Utilization of high cost placement for these children. • Third District Court will be having a Summit on Dual Jurisdiction September 2 or 3. • What preventative services are available when a five day notice is ordered? Invite children or former clients to talk |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|
| | Dashboard Items (cont.) | | about reasons. What are feelings of children that aged out of the system? Do they feel they were better because of DCFS? |
| | | March: Navina Forsythe attended meeting to assist evaluate the information needed to analyze Children served by the Court - Abused and Neglected vs. Delinquency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If children came into custody because of delinquency is it because a judge always puts children into custody? • If a child continues in delinquent behavior is DCFS meeting the needs of the child? March: See last page of minutes for list of questions and additional research needed. |
| Public Relations: | | January: February: Valentines to staff March: | January: February: March: |
| Studies: | | January: February: The Foster Parent Exit Survey was presented. (see attached) March: The committee was updated on the Foster Parent Exit Survey | January: February: SLVR is doing well. UFAFA – Utah Foster and Adoptive Families Association could use help. March: Half of foster families are new each year. It takes 200 new families each year to meet the need. Most families are leaving for the correct reasons. |
| CPS Issues: (September 16, 2008) | | January: February: March: | January: February: March: |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| QCR Participation: (September 16, 2008) | | January: February: March: | January: February: March: |
| Fatality Review: (September 16, 2008) | | January: February: March: | January: February: March: |
| | | January: DCFS lawsuit has been settled. | January: |
| Other Business: (February 17, 2009) | | Kerri Burns shared the objectives for Quality Improvement committees 1. Add diverse members 2. Increase knowledge and purpose of QIC statewide 3. Develop a plan to facilitate needed changes within DCFS for the upcoming year. The question was asked how the State budget crisis has affected SLVR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No employees have been hired upon vacancy of positions. There has not been an increase in caseloads yet, but may be coming. Some employees that are in positions that do not carry cases may be transferred to case carrying positions. SLVR has streamlined three support teams into two teams, kin support and foster support | Feedback for new state dashboard items is appreciated, Kerri's phone number is: 801-538-4324; e-mail: kketter@utah.gov |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Other Business: (Cont.) | | February: Mike Hamblin was elected to be the new co-chair starting July 2009. | February: |
| | | March: | March: |

Salt Lake Quality Improvement Committee Meeting 3-17-09

Utilizing Data Effectively To Inform Decisions/Recommendations

Main topic of discussion: Children entering custody for primary reason of delinquency.

The DCFS State Office study was handed out and reviewed. The percentage of all children entering custody that are delinquent is disproportionate by region. Children who are ordered into care for delinquency are not in care longer and do not have higher placements than children entering custody for other reasons when controlling for age. Children in custody for delinquency are more often in higher cost residential placements. The committee wants to look at some of these issues just within Salt Lake Valley Region.

- 1) Decide what area you want to review and why you want to review it - What specific questions are you seeking answers to?
 - a) Are there differences in the rates of children entering care for delinquency by judge?
 - b) How do the outcomes for children entering custody for delinquency compare to children entering for abuse/neglect/dependency reasons?
 - c) Are judges more likely to order delinquent females into custody instead of delinquent males?
 - d) When judges are considering ordering children into custody they can order a 5-day assessment or probation officers can request. How frequently do judges follow DCFS recommendations from 5-day assessment?
- 2) What information is necessary to answer these questions?
 - a) Percent of judge caseload entering foster care for delinquency.
 - b) Length of stay in custody for delinquency versus non-delinquency (controlling for age).
 - c) Number of placements in custody for delinquency versus non-delinquency (controlling for age).
 - d) QCR results for delinquency versus non-delinquency if available.
 - e) Rate of delinquent children entering custody by gender. We would need to somehow get a count of the entire delinquent population by gender from DJJS since the overall population may be disparate by gender we cannot determine disproportionality coming into custody unless we know total population.
 - f) Rate of agreement between judges order and 5-day assessment recommendations.
- 3) If I got the information above, in what ways could I utilize it?
 - a) Determine if there were differences in entry rates by judge.
 - b) Determine if outcomes for children entering care for delinquency are not as successful as for children entering for other reasons (controlling for age).
 - c) Determine if there is a disproportionate rate of entry by gender.
 - d) Determine if judges are following 5-day assessment recommendations.

- 4) What conclusions could be drawn?
 - a) If there are differences in how judges use DCFS custody for children who have delinquency charges.
 - b) Disparity in outcomes by reason for custody.
 - c) Disparity in gender rate of entry for delinquency.
 - d) Whether judges utilize and value 5-day assessment findings.
- 5) What recommendations could be made?
 - a) Information could be shared with judges via the court improvement project or the table of sixes to educate them on the differences and concerns.
 - b) Division could brainstorm with judges on better approaches to working with children with delinquency.
 - c) Division could work with probation to provide education and brainstorm other options as the probation officers may be the ones frequently recommending DCFS custody.
 - d) If outcomes are disparate then division might want to look at a different model of service for delinquent children or they may want to work toward having other agencies work with this population.
 - e) If judges do not follow 5-day assessment findings then may want to work with judges to find out why and if an alternative approach should be used.
- 6) Next Steps:
 - a) Tonya and Dawn will pull data on:
 - i) Percent of judge caseload entering foster care for delinquency.
 - ii) Length of stay in custody for delinquency versus non-delinquency (controlling for age).
 - iii) Number of placements in custody for delinquency versus non-delinquency (controlling for age).
 - iv) Children entering care for delinquency by gender (need to use with data Navina gathers from DJJS).
 - v) Gather information from a random sample of IHS 5-day notice cases to see the rate judges' orders are consistent with recommendations.
 - b) Navina will assist in gathering:
 - i) QCR results for delinquency versus non-delinquency if available (Note this request has already been made to OSR).
 - ii) Data from DJJS on delinquent children by gender (Note this request has already been made to DJJS).
- 7) Issues brought up for discussion – May be future issues for committee to look at:
 - a) School Prevention: School assesses risk and protective factors. Can the schools utilize this information sooner to refer to services to try to prevent children escalating to the point they need to enter custody? For example do children with truancy have

warning signs in other areas of their lives (e.g., have they been restricted from participating in student activities, attend resource classes, etc.).

- b) Youth aging out of custody: There was a concern about the outcomes of youth aging out of custody. Navina reviewed the new National Youth Transitional Database federal regulations. These regulations require that DCFS track delivery of TAL services paid for and provided by the state as well as follow samples of children from 17 to age 21. DCFS is trying to put this follow-up in place for all children instead of just the federally required sample every three years. Youth will be surveyed at 17, 19, and 21 regarding outcomes.
- c) Orders and charges for children in foster care: It was noted that a court study showed that there were more orders to show cause for children in custody than for other children. Concerns were raised that things were being brought to the courts attention for foster children that would not be brought there for children in custody of their parents. Might want to look at this in the future and possibly education probation officers and workers to be able tot ell judge when it is appropriate to file an order to show cause. Might want to work to facilitate a list for foster parents of consequences for children's behaviors that would be reported to DCFS but not to the court.
- d) Would it help reduce entry to custody to have GALs or AGs attend the five-day notice hearings? It was suggested that these offices pilot that, but capacity to do this was raised as an issue, so it was tabled for later discussion.
- e) Dual adjudication: Do children entering custody for delinquency also have abuse/neglect issues. If there are many of these then will want to look at the data above for these groups separately. Navina will assist in setting up these data reports.
- f) Disproportionality: A question was raised regarding disproportionality in race for this group of youth. Navina reviewed national studies and literature on disproportionality within child welfare. Studies have shown that there are societal and community factors as well as internal agency factors that may contribute to disproportionality. DCFS is currently working with the University of Utah Social Research Institute to design and conduct a study on disproportionality within Utah DCFS.